arXiv:physics/0104043v2 [physics.atom-ph] 12 Sep 2001

Coherent Control of Superfluidity in a Fermi Gas of Atoms

Matt Mackie*, Jyrki Piilo*, and Kalle-Antti Suominen*†
*Helsinki Institute of Physics, PL 64, FIN-00014 Helsingin yliopisto, Finland
†Department of Applied Physics, University of Turku, FIN-20014 Turun yliopisto, Finland

Juha Javanainen
Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06269-3046, USA
(February 2, 2008)

We theoretically examine photoassociation of a two-component Fermi degenerate gas, focusing on light-induced atom-atom interactions as a means to raise the critical temperature of the BCS transition to a superfluid state. As it stands, photoassociation-induced superfluidity is limited by spontaneous decay to experimentally inconvenient light intensities [Mackie *et al.*, Opt. Express **8**, 118 (2000)]. We therefore propose to use coherent control in photoassociation to a pair of molecular levels to cancel spontaneous emission, whereby the BCS transition should occur within reach of current experimental techniques.

PACS number(s): 05.30.Fk, 03.75.Fi, 34.50.Rk

Studies of degeneracy in Fermi gases [1,2] presently face bottlenecks in reaching temperatures cold enough to form Cooper pairs. Below the Fermi temperature, evaporative cooling of a dual Fermi gas begins to stall as the near-unit-occupied low energy states exhibit Pauli blocking [3], while in a mixture of Fermi and Bose gases the sympathetic cooling provided by ultracold bosons loses efficiency when the bosonic heat capacity falls below its fermionic counterpart [4]. The lowest achieved temperatures are thus about a third of the Fermi temperature [3,4], whereas Cooper pair formation requires a temperature of at least an order of magnitude lower [5,6]. However, by adjusting atom-atom interactions, it could be feasible to *raise* the BCS transition temperature to an experimentally accessible regime. Competing means of adjustment include the Feshbach resonance [7–9], rf microwave fields [10], dc electric fields [11], and photoassociation [12–14].

Mathematically identical [15], photoassociation [16] and the Feshbach resonance [17,18] have recently been proposed for driving superfluidity in a Fermi degenerate gas of atoms. In either case, the molecular state is, unfortunately, a serious liability. For the Feshbach resonance, the bound state lies very close to the dissociation threshold, and the subsequent sensitivity, *e.g.*, to collisions, will limit the lifetime of the Cooper pair– an issue not yet fully addressed. On the other hand, photoassociation generally occurs to an excited electronic state, and the superfluid lifetime is limited by spontaneous emission. As shown previously [16], a ten second lifetime requires a far-far-off resonant photoassociation laser (detuning $\sim 10^{14}\,\mathrm{Hz}$) and, consequently, a critical temperature of a tenth the Fermi temperature takes an enormous amount of light intensity ($\sim 10^8\,\mathrm{W/cm^2}$). The purpose of this Letter is therefore to develop a scheme for inducing the BCS transition to a superfluid state that is both robust and user-friendly.

We model a binary mixture of fermionic atoms, denoted by the fields $\phi_{1,2}(\mathbf{r})$, photoassociating into two different bosonic molecules, denoted by $\psi_{1,2}(\mathbf{r})$, a system that is a neutral particle version of the boson-fermion model of high-temperature superconductivity [19]. Instead of opposite-spin electrons, the fermions herein would typically be two states with different z components of angular momentum in the same atom, which, incidentally, bypasses the Pauli blocking of s-wave photoassociation. Now, a generic free-bound transition *via* photon absorption leads to a molecule that is unstable against spontaneous emission and, since there is no particular reason why this decay should deposit the ensuing population back into the Fermi sea, such a molecule is considered lost forever. Consequently, assuming photoassociation to vibrational levels in the same electronic manifold, we add a non-Hermitian term proportional to the spontaneous decay rate of the excited electronic state γ, and incorporate the possibility for quantum interference by considering a coherent superposition of molecular amplitudes.

The Hamiltonian density for the atom-molecule system described above is

$$\begin{aligned}\hbar^{-1}\mathcal{H} = &\sum_l \left[\phi_l^\dagger\left(-\frac{\hbar\nabla^2}{2m}\right)\phi_l + \psi_l^\dagger\left(-\frac{\hbar\nabla^2}{4m}+\delta_l\right)\psi_l\right] \\ &-\sum_l \kappa_l(\mathbf{r})\left(\psi_l^\dagger\phi_1\phi_2 + \phi_2^\dagger\phi_1^\dagger\psi_l\right) \\ &-\tfrac{1}{2}i\gamma\sum_{l,l'}\psi_l^\dagger\psi_{l'} + \lambda\phi_2^\dagger\phi_1^\dagger\phi_1\phi_2, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The detuning of the photoassociating laser from the respective vibrational levels is $\delta_l = \omega_\infty - \omega_L - \Delta_l$, where the binding energy of the lth molecular state is $\hbar\Delta_l$, the energy of the photon is $\hbar\omega_L$, and $\hbar\omega_\infty$ is the asymptotic energy difference between the two electronic manifolds ($l = 1, 2$). A low-momentum approximation is implicit, whereby relevant atom-atom collisions are described by a contact interaction of strength $\lambda = 4\pi\hbar a/m$, with a

being the s-wave scattering length. Similarly, correcting the bosonic result [14] with a statistical factor of $\sqrt{2}$, the (real) free-bound contact interaction strength κ_l is given as

$$\kappa_l(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{\epsilon_R \lambda\!\!\!^{-3/2}}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{I(\mathbf{r})}{I_0)_l}\right]^{1/2}. \tag{2}$$

Here $\epsilon_R = \hbar/2m\lambda\!\!\!^{-2}$ is the usual photon recoil frequency, $2\pi\lambda\!\!\!^{-}$ is the wavelength of the photoassociating light, and $I(\mathbf{r})$ is the prevailing light intensity at the position $\mathbf{r}$. Finally, if the photoassociation rate coefficient α_l is known (in cm^5) at a temperature T and detuning δ, the characteristic intensity $I_0)_l$ is given (in W/cm^2) as [14,16]

$$I_0)_l = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\sqrt{\hbar\delta}c\hbar^4}{2\alpha_l m^2 (k_B T)^{3/2} \lambda\!\!\!^{-2}}\, e^{-\hbar\delta/k_B T}. \tag{3}$$

Assuming that $|\delta_l|$ is the largest frequency scale in the Heisenberg equations of motion, we solve adiabatically for the molecular fields ψ_l. Substituting the result into Eq. (1) and keeping also the leading order of the imaginary part in the energy, we obtain an effective Hamiltonian density involving only fermions

$$\hbar^{-1}\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} = \sum_l \phi_l^\dagger \left(-\frac{\hbar\nabla^2}{2m}\right)\phi_l + \lambda_{\rm eff}\,\phi_2^\dagger\phi_1^\dagger\phi_1\phi_2. \tag{4}$$

The influence of photoassociating light on atom-atom interactions is now evident in the effective collisional interaction strength

$$\lambda_{\rm eff} = \lambda - \left(\frac{\kappa_1^2}{\delta_1} + \frac{\kappa_2^2}{\delta_2}\right) - \tfrac{1}{2} i\gamma \left(\frac{\kappa_1}{\delta_1} + \frac{\kappa_2}{\delta_2}\right)^2. \tag{5}$$

From the imaginary term in Eq. (5), it is clear that spontaneous decay of (virtual) excited molecules will limit the lifetime of the superfluid state through inelastic atom-atom scattering events. Combining Eqs. (2) and (5) gives the radiative Cooper pair lifetime as

$$\epsilon_R \tau = \frac{2}{\rho\lambda\!\!\!^{-3}} \frac{\delta_1^2}{\gamma\epsilon_R} \frac{1}{(1+R)^2}, \tag{6}$$

where the $R = (\delta_1/\delta_2)\sqrt{I_0)_2\,/\,I_0)_1}$ and $(\rho/2)^2$ was used for the dual-atom density term $\phi_2^\dagger\phi_1^\dagger\phi_1\phi_2$. We are evidently free to adjust the lifetime according to the ratio R and, in particular, $\tau = \infty$ is achieved by choosing $R = -1$. For $\delta_2 = \delta_1 + \omega_{21}$, where $\hbar\omega_{21} = \hbar(\Delta_1 - \Delta_2) > 0$ is the separation in energy between the molecular levels, and a characteristic intensity that scales with binding energy as [14] $I_0)_2\,/\,I_0)_1 = \sqrt{\Delta_2/\Delta_1}$, we find $\delta_1 = -\omega_{21}/(1 + \sqrt[4]{\Delta_1/\Delta_2}) \approx -\frac{1}{2}\omega_{21}(1 - \omega_{21}/\Delta_1)$, *i.e.*, the photoassociating laser should be tuned roughly halfway between the molecular levels. By exerting coherent control over photoassociation, not only is spontaneous decay hereafter a non-issue, but the detuning and light intensity will assume reasonable values.

Turning to the sought-after increase in the BCS transition temperature, we ignore the native scattering length a on the assumption that the associated collisional interaction alone is too weak for experimental utility. The atom-atom interactions are now due solely to the light-induced scattering length

$$\frac{a_L}{\lambda\!\!\!^{-}} = -\frac{1}{8\pi}\,\frac{\epsilon_R}{\delta_1}\,\frac{I}{I_0)_1}\left(1 + \sqrt[4]{\frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_2}}\,R\right). \tag{7}$$

Canceling spontaneous decay as above yields $(1 + \sqrt[4]{\Delta_1/\Delta_2}\,R)/\delta_1 > 0$, and therefore the attractive interaction necessary for Cooper pairing. Having assumed the detuning is large enough to allow for adiabatic elimination of the molecular field, the rigorous Fermi-Bose thermodynamics will reduce to the usual BCS theory [18]; hence, the critical temperature for the superfluid transition is approximately $T_c = T_F \exp[-\frac{1}{2}\pi/k_F|a_L|\,]$, where $T_F = \hbar^2 k_F^2/2mk_B$ and $k_F = (3\pi^2\rho)^{1/3}$ are the Fermi temperature and wave number, respectively. Substituting Eq. (7) along with $R = -1$ gives

$$\frac{T_c}{T_F} = \exp\left[-\frac{18.1239}{(\rho\lambda\!\!\!^{-3})^{1/3}}\,\frac{|\delta_1|}{\epsilon_R}\,\frac{I_0)_1}{I}\left|1 - \sqrt[4]{\frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_2}}\right|^{-1}\right]. \tag{8}$$

Degeneracy has been observed for ^{40}K [1] and ^{6}Li [4,2], but the spectroscopic data are more plentiful for ^{6}Li and we discuss explicit numbers for this species only. In our example, we use the vibrational states $\nu = 79$ and $\nu = 80$, with respective dissociation energies [23] $\Delta_1 = 31.58$ and $\Delta_2 = 22.61 \times 2\pi$ GHz, which leads to the detuning $|\delta_1| = 4.3 \times 2\pi$ GHz. The fixed parameters have the following values [14]: the wavelength is $2\pi\lambda\!\!\!^{-} = 671$ nm; the photon recoil frequency is $\epsilon_R = 63.3 \times 2\pi$ MHz; the density is assumed such that $\rho\lambda\!\!\!^{-3} = 1$; and, finally, the characteristic intensity for the $\nu = 79$ state is 9.8 mW/cm^2. Hence, the estimated intensity required to make $T_c/T_F = 0.1$ is $I = 30$ kW/cm^2, which is marginal at best.

To make further progress, we must appreciate the physics behind the canceling of spontaneous emission. Let us regard the transitions from an atom pair to molecular levels 1 and 2 as charged harmonic oscillators excited by light. The amplitudes of the oscillators may be adjusted by tuning the laser frequency. When the light is tuned between the two transition frequencies, it also drives one of the oscillators below resonance and the other one above resonance. The oscillations, and the radiation from the two oscillators, therefore have opposite phases. By a suitable choice of the amplitudes (*i.e.*, light frequency) the spontaneous emission cancels. Analogous cancellations are of course well known in quantum-optical few level atomic systems [20,21]. Although a molecular system has many more degrees of freedom, the proliferation of rovibrational states– and even dissociation continua– does not in principle invalidate our scheme. Despite a large number of oscillators, there still exists a

driving frequency that results in cancellation of the radiation [22]. As the oscillators closest to resonance have the largest amplitudes, such a frequency should be close to the value deduced for the oscillators nearest to resonance.

Meanwhile, the change in the scattering length reflects light shifts of the molecular levels. In the model with two molecular levels of Eq. (5), the two light shift terms proportional to $1/\delta_l$ work against each other. At the point of vanishing spontaneous emission there is a nonzero change in the scattering length, and of the right sign, only because the characteristic intensities (dipole matrix elements for photoassociation) were taken to decrease (increase) going up the vibrational ladder, which is the usual case in a molecule. Among the further off-resonance states, we expect the ones above resonance dominate. The resulting added change in the scattering length then has the right sign for Cooper pairing, and may be substantial since the light shift from a level decreases only inversely proportional to the detuning.

With these considerations in mind, the multitude of states in a molecule actually helps our cause. For instance, if we were to take into account in our argument four additional states below the state $\nu = 79$ and four states above the state $\nu = 80$ (see Ref. [23] for the dissociation energies), and assume the $\sqrt{\Delta}$ scaling of the characteristic intensities, we find that the detuning needed to cancel spontaneous emission becomes $|\delta_1| = 2.8 \times 2\pi$ GHz, and the intensity to make $T_c/T_F = 0.1$ is now $I = 4$ kW/cm^2. This value is indeed an experimentally feasible.

A truly quantitative prediction of the intensity required for the BCS transition amounts to a calculation of an off-resonance light shift, a notoriously difficult assignment. In this task experimental trial and error may be an easier way to proceed. Should the dipole matrix elements turn out to be uncooperatively small, one may also envisage a two-color scheme where the primarily photoassociated molecules are coupled with second laser to another molecular state. Cancellation of spontaneous decay occurs (to lowest nontrivial order) as in the one-color case, and the added shifts from off-resonant two-photon transitions will give a handle to control atom loss and atom-atom interactions more independently than is possible with just one laser.

All told, by allowing for the cancellation of spontaneous decay for reasonable values of detuning and laser intensity, coherently controlled photoassociation should provide a means for creating a superfluid state in a Fermi gas of atoms that is well within the reach of current experimental techniques.

We thank John Calsamiglia and Chris Pethick for helpful discussions. This work supported by the Academy of Finland (MM, JP, and KAS), as well as NSF and NASA (JJ). MM thanks NORDITA Institute for Theoretical Physics for generous hospitality. JP acknowledges support from the National Graduate School on Modern Optics and Photonics

[1] B. DeMarco and D. S. Jin, Science **285**, 1703 (1999).
[2] F. Schreck, G. Ferrari, K. L. Corwin, J. Cubizolles, L. Khaykovich, M.-O. Mewes, and C. Salomon, Phys. Rev. A **64** 011402 (R) (2001).
[3] M. J. Holland, B. DeMarco, and D. S. Jin, Phys. Rev. A 61, 053610 (2000).
[4] A. G. Truscot, K. E. Strecker, W. I. McAlexander, G. B. Partridge, and R. G. Hulet, Science **291**, 2570 (2001).
[5] H. T. C. Stoof, M. Houbiers, C. A. Sackett, and R. G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 10 (1996).
[6] M. Houbiers, H. T. C. Stoof, R. Ferwerda, W. I. McAlexander, C. A. Sackett, and R. G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4864 (1997).
[7] E. Tiesinga, A. J. Moerdijk, B. J. Verhaar, and H. T. C. Stoof, Phys. Rev. A **46**, R1167 (1993).
[8] J. M. Vogels, C. C. Tsai, R. S. Freeland, S. J. J. M. F. Kokkelmans, B. J. Verhaar, and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **56**, R1067 (1997).
[9] S. L. Cornish, N. R. Claussen, J. L. Roberts, E. A. Cornell, and C. E. Wieman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1795 (2000).
[10] A. J. Moerdijk, B. J. Verharr, and T. M. Nagtegaal, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 4343 (1996).
[11] M. Marinescu and L. You, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4596 (1998).
[12] P. O. Fedichev, Yu. Kagen, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and J. T. M. Walraven, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2913 (1996).
[13] J. L. Bohn and P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 1486 (1997).
[14] M. Koštrun, M. Mackie, R. Côté, and J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 063616 (2000).
[15] E. Timmermans, K. Furuya, P. W. Milonni and A. K. Kerman, LANL e-print cond-mat/0103327.
[16] M. Mackie, E. Timmermans, R. Côté, and J. Javanainen, Opt. Express **8**, 118 (2000).
[17] J. L. Bohn, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 053409 (2000).
[18] M. Holland, S. J. J. M. F. Kokkelmans, M. Chiofalo, and R. Walser, LANL e-print cond-mat/0103479.
[19] R. Friedberg and T. D. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 6745 (1989).
[20] S.-Y. Zhu and M. O. Scully, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 388 (1996).
[21] E. Paspalakis and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 293 (1998).
[22] Normally, this kind of many-level cancellations of spontaneous-emission fail on angular momenta: Radiation from two oscillators that have different polarizations (say, one going in the x direction and the other in the y direction) cannot cancel. However, to zeroth order, vibrational level structure makes replicas of the same electronic transitions separated by vibrational level spacings, and the cancellation should indeed work.
[23] E. R. I. Abraham, N. W. M. Ritchie, W. I. McAlexander, and R. G. Hulet, J. Chem. Phys. **103**, 7773 (1995).